1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
3	CHODGE ADMEN
	GEORGE ARTEM, ) Plaintiff )
4	vs. ) No. 1:21-CV-10981-WGY
5	NEW ENGLAND LAW   BOSTON, and )
6	SCOTT BROWN,  Defendants. )
7	)
8	)
9	
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. YOUNG
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  HEARING
12	REARING
13	
14	
15	John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse
16	One Courthouse Way Boston, Massachusetts 02210
17	
18	July 19, 2021 10:59 a.m.
19	
20	
21	
22	Kristin M. Kelley, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
23	John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse One Courthouse Way, Room 3209
24	Boston, Massachusetts 02210 E-mail: kmob929@gmail.com
25	Mechanical Steno - Computer-Aided Transcript
۷ ک	mechanical Sceno - Computer-Alded Italiscript

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	George Artem
4	38 Grove Street, #B
5	Boston, MA 02114
6	206-953-6231
7	Email: Georgeartem1@outlook.com
8	PRO SE.
9	
10	
11	Laurie F. Rubin
12	Daniel S. Tarlow
13	Michael Thompson
14	Prince Lobel Tye LLP
15	One International Place
16	Suite 3700
17	Boston, MA 02114
18	617-456-8020
19	Email: Lrubin@princelobel.com
20	for Defendant.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## PROCEEDINGS

11:00 20

11:00 10

THE CLERK: Now hearing Civil Matter 21-10981, Artem versus New England Law, et al.

THE COURT: Good morning. This is a meeting held on our Zoom platform. Our host for the hearing is courtroom

Deputy Clerk Jennifer Gaudet. One of our official court reporters is taking down these proceedings. I have a law clerk on the line. They are open to the public. If any members of the public are present, they are welcome.

I do need to remind any members of the public that are online that you must keep your microphone muted. The rules of Court remain in full force and effect and there is no rebroadcasting, streaming or other transcription of these proceedings.

With that said, this is the defendant's motion to dismiss.

Mr. Artem, if you would introduce yourself so I can see you here.

MR. ARTEM: Good morning, your Honor. I am here.

THE COURT: Thank you and welcome. And representing the school?

MS. RUBIN: Laurie Rubin from Prince Lobel with my

colleagues Dan Tarlow and Michael Thompson.

THE COURT: Good morning to you.

Mr. Artem, a couple of questions for you. You're not

11:01 10

11:02 20

yet a lawyer. Don't think this is disrespectful. You have every right to represent yourself, but my practice when someone represents themselves is always to ask you if you intend to get an attorney. Now, you understand that I am perfectly happy to have you represent yourself and to entertain your argument, but I'm not your attorney and I must hold you to an appropriate standard of pleading. So I ask if you want an attorney and are going to get one. If you are, I'll give 30 days for the attorney to appear, make any motions or corrections in the complaint that the attorney made or make none. Then I'll decide the matter.

So let me ask you if you want to proceed yourself, as is your right, or do you want to try and get an attorney here.

MR. ARTEM: Well, your Honor, thank you for that. I believe for the hearing today that there is enough for me to proceed with my own argument. I have been in consultation with attorneys, and we decided that would be the best path forward for today simply because I'm the one most familiar with the argument and having someone appear at the 11th hour would be a disservice.

THE COURT: It's your right to appear and that's fine. Let me ask a couple of questions here. What year are you in of the law school?

MR. ARTEM: So, technically, I'm still in my first year of law school, but it is because I'm in the evening

```
It takes a while to get out of your first year, so
     1
         technically I'm between the summer in between my 1L year and 2L
     2
     3
         year.
                  THE COURT: Thank you. That makes good sense.
     4
                                                                   How
     5
         long will the program run for someone who takes evening
         courses?
     6
     7
                  MR. ARTEM: Four years. So I'm class of 2024.
     8
                  THE COURT: I see. Where are you living while you are
         pursuing your legal studies?
                  MR. ARTEM: I'm here in Beacon Hill.
11:03 10
    11
                  THE COURT: You have a day job, do you?
    12
                  MR. ARTEM: Yes, your Honor. During the day I
         contract with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. I work for
    13
    14
         the Executive Office of Health and Human Services. I'd like to
         caveat that whatever I say today is my own opinion and does not
    15
         reflect the views of the Department of Health and Human
    16
         Services.
    17
    18
                  THE COURT: Thank you for that. I fully appreciate
    19
         that. And that's very well said.
11:04 20
                  THE COURT: Do you vote here?
    21
                  MR. ARTEM: I'm a resident of the state of Washington,
    22
         and I'm here for law school.
    23
                  THE COURT: There is a question here about the
         diversity jurisdiction of the court. All right.
    24
    25
                  Well, I carefully reviewed the papers here. Let me
```

11:06 20

11:05 10

tell you what I think. Then I'm going to let you argue, though it's their motion. I'm looking at the question here. I don't think you've raised a federal question. There's some real question I have about whether this requirement is sufficiently pled as a contract case, but I'll hear you.

MR. ARTEM: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.

In formulating this complaint, one of the first things that I attempted to answer was this question of jurisdiction. In taking a step back and reviewing the complaint, one of the things that I've realized is, as in a game of chess, I've attempted to move two pieces at once. So the anchor of the claim here really is a contract claim for the same reasons that the breach here is really an unconscionable repudiation. So for the same reasons why the new conditions of our agreement are unconscionable, they're also unlawful.

So the preemption claim is really rooted in a breach of contract. I'd be happy to go through the elements of the breach of contract claim if you'd like, but I think to answer the jurisdictional question, the reality here is that it's a breach of contract claim under diversity.

THE COURT: Well, have you articulated a contract claim upon which the Court could grant relief?

MR. ARTEM: Yes, your Honor. So for the Erie doctrine, there are five elements to satisfy a breach of contract claim that I believe are --

11:08 20

11:08 10

THE COURT: It's not under the Erie doctrine. If we're under the Erie doctrine, it's the law of Massachusetts.

One of the elements, the one on which I think you've stumbled here, is that this falls within any agreed to aspect of your relationship with the law school. This doesn't seem to be what you contracted for. I just don't see how they breached any contract here by their requirements.

MR. ARTEM: So the original agreement, your Honor, was the unconditional, quote unquote, no strings attached scholarship.

THE COURT: Well, so you say. You formulate it that way. What's your best case here? Has any court so held that there is, on the basis of the school handbook and the like, a contract claim such as this? I've had occasion to write on these type of claims, if you've looked at this Court's jurisprudence. I'm letting a case go forward against Suffolk University on a contract and unjust enrichment type theory, but that's vastly different than this. I just don't see the contract here. I just don't see how this public health requirement somehow is a breach of some contract.

MR. ARTEM: Well, your Honor, would you concede that a contract does exist?

THE COURT: I think you have a relationship with the school.

MR. ARTEM: Right. So Massachusetts law requires, as

far as I understand, requires only an agreement, which is a 1 meeting of the minds. I believe it's clear that there is both 2 an offer and acceptance and clearly that there is consideration, seeing that I have moved across the country, and 5 there is a course of performance here, your Honor, that, frankly, the defendants show a pattern of repudiation --7 THE COURT: Respectfully, Mr. Artem, that's 8 conclusatory. You say that. You say that the deal was this no strings attached scholarship. 11:10 10 Let me just try it in a practical matter. I'm sure in 11 a first year of law school your professors do this in a more 12 scholarly case. Have you uncovered any case in any jurisdiction where the requirement that the school has a public 13 14 health requirement that the school seeks to impose, which many schools in the Boston area are imposing -- that isn't 15 determinative in the matter. I understand that. But have you 16 found any court to have declared that that violates some 17 18 contract? Any court? 19 MR. ARTEM: Well, your Honor, the alternative would be to look at the Title IX cases and to look --11:10 20 21 THE COURT: This is not Title IX because there's no 22 gender aspects here. There's nothing. Title IX addresses a 23 different problem. You said yourself, and I agree with you, 24 that, at bottom, this is a supposed contract case. I just 25 don't see that the contract covers this, if a contract there

```
1
         is.
                  All right. I think I have no choice but to dismiss
     2
         it. I'm going to dismiss it with prejudice because --
     3
                  MR. ARTEM: Your Honor, if I may, before you do that,
     4
     5
         I respectfully would like to request a ruling on my motion to
         strike the footnotes from the defendant's motion.
     7
         Additionally, I'd like to preserve my right under 15(a)(1)(B)to
         amend the complaint, as a matter of course.
     9
                   THE COURT: But amendment -- I'll take the second
         first.
11:12 10
    11
                   The amendment, in these circumstances there is no
    12
         plausible ground for relief, none that you've suggested you'd
    13
         like to amend to, nothing. So it's dismissed with prejudice.
    14
         You have the right to appeal from any findings or rulings the
    15
         Court has made against you.
                   The motion to strike footnotes is denied. That's the
    16
         ruling of the Court.
    17
    18
                  We'll recess.
    19
                   (Whereupon, the proceedings adjourned at 11:13 a.m.)
    20
    21
    22
    23
    24
    25
```

```
1
                       CERTIFICATE
 2
 3
 4
    UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT )
 5
    DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS )
 6
 7
              I, Kristin M. Kelley, certify that the foregoing is a
 8
 9
    correct transcript from the record of proceedings taken
    July 19, 2021 in the above-entitled matter to the best of my
10
11
    skill and ability.
12
13
14
         /s/ Kristin M. Kelley July 20, 2021
15
         Kristin M. Kelley, RPR, CRR
                                               Date
         Official Court Reporter
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```